

|  |                                      |   |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/730,117 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>MAKISHIMA ET AL. |  |
|  | <b>Examiner</b><br>RICHARD M. BEMBEN | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2622                 |  |

  

**All Participants:**

(1) RICHARD M. BEMBEN.

(2) Paul T. Sewell (Reg. No. 61,784).

**Date of Interview:** 16 February 2010

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)  
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**  
Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:  
1, 6, 9 as numbered in the RCE filed 11 January 2010.

Prior art documents discussed:

**Status of Application:** 30

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 11AM EST

**Part II.**  
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: There were actually two interviews spanning the time period of 28 January 2010 (examiner's initial contact) - 16 February 2010 (issues resolved). The first interview (agreement reached 2 February 2010) dealt with claims 1, 6, and 9 (as numbered in the RCE filed 11 January 2010). Claims 1 and 9 were amended to include the "to be printed" claim requirement and claim 6 was canceled due to redundancy with claim 1. The second interview (agreement reached 16 February 2010) dealt with claim 9. Claim 9 was amended to include the "when they are displayed at the same time on said display" claim requirement. Claim 9 was also amended to require the "digital image data" amendments to ensure antecedent basis throughout the claim. See the accompanying Allowance.